

LINCOLN PLANNING BOARD

DECEMBER 15, 2004

MINUTES

The regular meeting of the Planning Board was held on Wednesday, December 15, 2004 at the Town Hall, 100 Old River Road, Lincoln, RI.

Chairman Mancini opened the meeting at 7:05 p.m. The following members were present: David Lund, John Mancini, Gregory Mercurio, William Murphy, Gerald Olean and Michael Reilly. Absent was Diane Hopkins. Also in attendance were Town Planner Albert Ranaldi and Town Engineer Kim Wiegand. Margaret Weigner kept the minutes.

Chairman Mancini advised six members present; have a quorum.

SECRETARY'S REPORT

There were no secretary reports for review.

CONSENT AGENDA

Chairman Mancini advised there are three zoning applications and

asked if any member would like to consider any separately. Mr. Reilly asked about the applicant from Crestwood Lane. Mr. Ranaldi stated that the applicant may submit the plans to the Zoning Board, and the Zoning Board will decide if they have enough information to make a decision. Mr. Olean stated that there is no recommendation for approval or denial. Mr. Ranaldi further stated that he would like to see both lots combined. Mr. Olean made a motion to accept the Consent Agenda as recommended by the Technical Review Committee. Mr. Murphy seconded motion. Motion passed unanimously.

CORRESPONDENCE/MISCELLANEOUS

Since there was time before the public hearing was scheduled, Chairman Mancini asked about the review of the Zoning Regulations. Mr. Ranaldi stated that he would be preparing a Request for Proposals next week. The Planning Board has completed going through the Subdivision Regulations and would like to review the final copy in January and schedule a public hearing.

Mr. Ranaldi stated that the state is reviewing the Affordable Housing Plan, and once it is approved by the state, it will become part of the Comprehensive Plan.

Chairman Mancini asked Mr. Ranaldi about the Economic Development Plan, and Mr. Ranaldi stated that he hasn't had the time to review the plan yet.

MAJOR SUBDIVISION REVIEW

a. Sunview Street Subdivision AP 13 Lot 31 Public Hearing – 7:15 p.m.

**Seminole Development Sunview Street Preliminary Plan
Discussion/
Approval**

Chairman Mancini stated that the Master Plan and Preliminary Plan levels are being combined.

Mr. Ranaldi explained that this is a subdivision of one lot into two and was elevated to a major subdivision because a waiver is needed for the slopes. The TRC reviewed the neighborhood and noted that a majority of the homes have slopes or retaining walls. The TRC determined that the waiver is appropriate – the TRC does not take waivers lightly.

Chairman Mancini stated that any waiver moves a subdivision up from minor to major. A major subdivision requires a public hearing.

The developer will explain plan and the public will have a chance to ask questions.

Developer Paul Vanasse of Seminole Development stated that the plan is to split existing lot #31 into two lots. Mrs. Raymond currently resides at lot #31. The new lot will be a dimensionally correct buildable lot consisting of 9,000 sq. ft. A 3 ½ foot wall will be built along the easterly border conforming to properties in neighborhood. A single family home will be built according to zoning regulations. An existing curb cut will be utilized.

Ms. Wiegand stated that there are no physical constraints with ground water or surface water.

Abutter Robert Halkyard of 10 Sunview Street asked what type of wall it would be and where on the property it would be located. Mr. Somyk of Seminole Development stated that it would be a versa lock wall along the edge of the property, and would be approximately 1' off of the property line. Mr. Halkyard stated that he does not have water problems now and does not want any water problems with wall being there. Ms. Wiegand stated that the building plans would be reviewed, and the Town looks at the water issues very carefully and would ask for dry wells if needed.

Attorney Steve Murray stated that he is representing abutter Nancy Rossiter of 11 Sunview Street. He has concerns beyond the slope of

the lot. He submitted documents to each Board member. Mr. Reilly asked if the Town Planner or Town Engineer has reviewed the documents he submitted. Chairman Mancini told Mr. Murray to give a rundown to Board. Mr. Murray stated that the developer stated that the wall would be 3 ½', but the survey submitted shows the wall at 7'. The low point is shown at 131' and it goes up to 138' at the top of the wall. Chairman Mancini asked how high the wall is and Mr. Somyk replied that it is 3 ½' high. Ms. Wiegand stated that other houses have walls in area.

Mr. Murray stated that no houses in neighborhood have walls. He stated that the submitted survey shows 21,955 sq. ft. The Town shows the property to have 165' sq. ft. less. Lot #2 must be 9,000 sq. ft. The plan submitted is not signed or stamped by a surveyor. Plat #50 shows lot layout. Mr. Ranaldi stated that he would take the survey from the surveyor, not from the plat map. Mr. Murray stated that the original plat does not show 9,000 sq. ft. Mr. Reilly stated that the line can change. Mr. Murray further stated that Mrs. Raymond's house is 18.9' off west lot line, and that the house is not centered. He disagrees with Town officials – there are no 7' walls in area. Chairman Mancini stated that the Town is not saying there are 7' walls. Mr. Murray stated that tons of fill will be needed. Mr. Somyk stated that no fill will be brought in, the wall is 3 ½' high, and he has a stamped plan signed by surveyor Steve Long. Mr. Halkyard asked if the wall would be 3' or 3 ½' and Mr. Somyk replied that it would be 3 ½'.

Abutters Leonid and Olga Nabutovsky asked how the wall will affect their property value and stated that the wall will be ugly. Judging by the slope of the land, wall would have to be 5'. Mr. Vanasse stated that out of 12 abutting properties, 6 have walls. Lot #12 has a 6 ½' wall with fence on property. Mr. Murray stated that the wall along the whole length of the property makes a difference.

Mr. Olean made a motion to close the public hearing. Mr. Reilly seconded motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Chairman Mancini has concerns about lot size. The Planning Board has until March 1, 2005 to make a decision.

Mr. Olean made a motion to table matter until next month. Mr. Mercurio seconded motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Reilly stated that he would like to have a stamped plan showing all changes and with the correct wall height. He is not sure that the Planning Board is looking at the same plan that Mr. Ranaldi has.

Chairman Mancini stated that the issues are: (1) determine if lot is valid – 9,000 sq. ft., (2) plans are stamped by certified surveyor, (3) height and type of wall, (4) provide more information to Board.

Mr. Murphy asked about elevations and drainage and Ms. Wiegand stated that she will look carefully at building plans. Mr. Ranaldi

stated that if this was a larger subdivision, they would look closer at slopes. Ms. Wiegand stated that if she thinks the plans wouldn't work, then she would ask for information upfront; otherwise, at building permit level.

Mr. Mercurio stated that he was confused with wall height and thought the developer should compromise wall height. He wants the wall height illustrated on plan, and wants to make sure water will not go onto abutter Mr. Halkyard's property.

Chairman Mancini asked Board members to look over information provided by Attorney Murray. Mr. Murray asked about notification for the next meeting and Chairman Mancini advised him to call the Planning Department.

b. Angell Road Subdivision AP 44 Lots 12 & 32 Preliminary Plan Discussion

Angell Road Development Co. Angell & Whipple Roads Approval

Mr. Ranaldi stated that the applicant is requesting five waivers. The TRC recommends approval of Preliminary Plan with the ten conditions listed in the TRC report. The Town is working diligently on numbers for offsite improvements. The developer feels that open space fees should be at the rate for the 1995 Subdivision Regulations of 5% and not the 2001 rate of 10%. A remediation bond has been set for \$18,000.00 before construction begins. Public improvements are

installed, then final approval is given and lots are sold. A performance bond allows the developer to sell lots, and then do public improvements.

Attorney Michael Kelly stated that the developer has a long history with this project. The developer has agreed to withdraw the Comprehensive Permit Application. The Town should take that into consideration for open space fees. There will be sidewalks on one side, so no waiver is needed. Waivers are needed for lots #1 and #2 for drainage issues. Easements for the detention basins have been forwarded to the Town Engineer and the Town Solicitor. The owner of lot #5 will have full liability and maintenance of basin, and the basin would be inspected every two years by a certified engineer. There would be an escrow account for the pump station (offsite improvements). An amendment was sent in to the Department of Environmental Management (DEM) to change the number of lots from 15 to 13. Testing will be done to determine ground water elevation. An evergreen buffer area will be installed on proposed lot #5 along property line and around basin, and existing lot #217 along the property line, and around the proposed pumping station.

Chairman Mancini stated that the Town has worked long and hard with the developer and agrees with the developer that open space fees should be set at 5%. Mr. Olean stated that no waiver is needed on sidewalks.

Mr. Olean made a motion to accept the recommendation of the TRC and to include the ten conditions as noted on the TRC report. Mr. Mercurio amended motion to include the condition that the developer rescinds the Comprehensive Permit Application. Mr. Mercurio seconded motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Chairman Mancini stated that the Board will not delegate final approval to the Administrative Officer. The developer must come back before the Board for final approval.

**c. Meadow View Subdivision AP 29 Lot 3 Pre-Application Review/
Meridian Real Estate Services, Inc. Great Road Discussion**

Mr. Ranaldi explained that this subdivision consists of 13 acres, is zoned RS 20, and is in front of the Board tonight as a Pre-Application discussion, which means there is no clock running. The proposal is to divide one lot into 15 conventional, single family lots with public water and sewer.

Mr. Ranaldi stated that wetlands approval would be needed from RI DEM at Preliminary Plan stage. The developer needs to request water service and sewer availability. The water commission is no longer accepting dead end water services – service must be looped. Drainage is a great concern, especially the proposed detention basin. Seasonal high groundwater elevation needs to be established. A

traffic engineer needs to perform a traffic study since the road is a narrow, winding country road. The buildable lot area for each lot could not be determined for each lot. The lot proposed as open space is unusable to the Town. The detention basin needs to be put on one lot. The road length, consisting of two cul de sacs, could be longer than the Subdivision Regulations allow if it is considered one road. Lot #12 has frontage on two streets making it a through lot, which is not allowed. The proposed sidewalks do not appear functional. The TRC has concerns about the visual impact to Historic Great Road since it is one of the first roads in Rhode Island designated as such. It is in the Town's interest to protect the visual impact to Great Road and the Town would request a vegetative easement so that vegetation is not disturbed.

Chairman Mancini stated that a lot of people are interested in this proposed project. The applicant is looking for feedback from the Board. The TRC that reviewed the plans consists of the Town Planner, Town Engineer, Planning Board members, Zoning Official, and other town officials. The developer can come back with a plan and the Planning Board will determine if the plan has validity. At Master Plan level, if plans look fine, then a public informational meeting is held, and at Preliminary Plan level, a public hearing will be held and abutters will be notified. At this level, water, sewer and drainage issues are detailed. Final Plan approval is the last stage.

Attorney William Landry stated that this is a 13 acre parcel. The

applicant has met with the Town staff to identify issues. The views and character of Great Road will be preserved. There will be five or six lots with frontage on Great Road. There will be approximately 900' of permanent vegetative buffers along Great Road. The development requires no substantial waivers, and all lots meet minimum buildable lot area. Drainage is subject to further studies. A traffic engineer will determine maximum site distance. The total road distance is 720'.

Chairman Mancini states that proposed lots #3, 4, 5, and 6 abut open space. Mr. Ranaldi stated that the Town doesn't want the land as open space. Chairman Mancini stated that lots would have to go back to property line and a waiver on 2 ½:1 ratio would be required. The detention basin must be contained on one lot. Mr. Ranaldi questioned whether the road was considered two cul de sacs. Mr. Reilly asked if lot #1 was a buildable lot, and Mr. Ranaldi replied that at this stage, the plans are looked at differently. Mr. Reilly asked about lot #12, and Mr. Ranaldi explained that because this lot has frontage on two streets, it was a zoning issue.

Mr. Mercurio is concerned about having a double cul de sac and suggested making one larger diameter cul de sac. Chairman Mancini stated that the Board would rather give a waiver for an increase of 20' to the proposed road and cul de sac, then two cul de sacs. Mr. Mercurio was concerned with having only one egress in case of emergencies. Mr. Lund stated that the water department no longer

allows dead end connections.

Mr. Leonard Bradley, of DiPrete Engineering, stated that soil evaluations would be performed on each lot to determine seasonal high groundwater. A traffic report is being prepared to determine site distance. He is confident that all lots meet buildable lot area. Driveways on Great Road will be minimized. He is aware of visual impact and a landscape architect will be brought in to preserve the rural character of Great Road.

Chairman Mancini stated that the Planning Board does not give out waivers easily. The applicant may have to give up some lots. Mr. Bradley stated that he wants to present a project that meets all subdivision regulations. Mr. Mercurio asked if the project works economically, and Mr. Bradley responded that he may not work economically if the applicant loses three lots. Chairman Mancini stated that by moving the lot lines back to the property line on lots #3, 4, 5, and 6, they will lose lots. The Board may give waivers if developer has no control, but the developer has control in this matter and will have to give up lots. Mr. Olean asked what the address would be on lot #12 and Ms. Wiegand responded that it would be up to the E911 system – it may have to be off the cul de sac.

There being no further business to discuss, on a motion made by Mr. Olean and seconded by Mr. Murphy, it was unanimously voted to adjourn. Meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Margaret Weigner

Dear Honorable Members,

On December 7, 2004 at 3:30 pm the Technical Review Committee met to review the agenda items for the December 15, 2004 Planning Board meeting. In attendance were Al Ranaldi, Kim Wiegand, David Lund, Russell Hervieux, Ann Marie Either, and Peggy Weigner. Below are the Committee's recommendations:

Major Subdivision Review

- a. Sunview Street Subdivision AP 13 Lot 31 Public Hearing – 7:15 PM**
 - Seminole Development Sunview Street Preliminary Plan Discussion /Approval**

This application is under the 2001 Subdivision Regulations and represents the subdivision of one lot into two lots. The Planning Board agenda for November had this application down as a minor subdivision. This was a mistake and should have been down as a major subdivision according to Section 1 Article B (41) request for a

waiver from the Subdivision Regulations. Therefore, the plan received Certificate of Completeness on November 1, 2004 in which the Planning Board has 120 days (March 1, 2005) to approve the preliminary plan as submitted, approve with changes and/or conditions, or deny the applicant. The Planning Board approved the application to proceed to the public hearing stage.

The TRC and the Engineering Division reviewed the above proposed development according to the Land Development and Subdivision Regulations preliminary plan submission standards and requirements and standard engineering. While the proposed subdivision represents good land development, it requires one waiver. The subdivision requires a waiver from Section 1, Article B(10) – Buildable lot area. The eastern section of the lot contains slopes greater than 15%. While this situation would not be considered in the planning of larger subdivisions, the applicant has presented photos of the surrounding neighborhood. Based on the photos and a site visit, a large majority of the existing houses in the area have retaining walls or have been built into the slope.

Therefore, based on the submitted plans, the fact that this is a proposal for only one lot, and that a large majority of the surrounding houses either have retaining walls to address the slopes or are built into the slope, the Technical Review Committee feels that this proposed subdivision represents a unique situation in this specific area and recommends that the subdivision be approved. The TRC would also like to note the requirement of open space fee. The TRC also recommends that final approval be delegated to the

administrative officer.

b. Angell Road Subdivision AP 44 Lots 12, 32 Preliminary Plan Discussion/

- Angell Road Development Co. Angell Rd, Whipple Rd Approval

This project represents the subdivision of one lot into thirteen conventional single-family lots. The subject lot contains 11.03 acres of land and is located in zoning district RS-20 (20,000 square feet – Residential Single Family). On August 25, 2004, this new project was certified as complete and referred to the Planning Board for their regularly scheduled September meeting for review as a Master Plan. According to our Subdivision Regulations, the Planning Board shall, within one hundred twenty (120) days of certification of completeness, or within such further time as may be consented to by the applicant, approve the Master Plan as submitted, approve with changes and/or conditions, or deny the applicant, according to the requirements of Section 8. A decision on the Master Plan review must be made by December 23, 2004 or within such further time as may be consented to by the applicant.

The Technical Review Committee and the Engineering Division has reviewed the above-proposed development according to the 2001 Land Development and Subdivision Regulations preliminary plan submission standards and requirements and engineering practice standards. The submission includes a set of 10 sheets entitled “Master/Preliminary Plan Submission for Angell Road Subdivision”,

Lincoln Rhode Island, AP 44 Lot 12, prepared for Leslie W. Sables by Commonwealth Engineers & Consultants, Inc., revised October 20, 2004. The Engineering Division also received and reviewed a report entitled “Storm Water Management Analysis and Design for AP 44 Lot 12 in Lincoln, Rhode Island”, prepared by Commonwealth Engineers & Consultants, Inc., for Leslie W. Sables, revision date June 22, 2004. The Town received a new letter from Ms. Linda Layer, P.E. dated October 14, 2004. A copy of a revised traffic report entitled “Traffic Impact Assessment Report” prepared for the above applicant by the above engineer revision date October 13, 2004 was also recently received. At this stage of review, the applicant is requesting five waivers. The waivers requested are:

- 1. A waiver from Section 24, Article A (5) – Sidewalks – waiver requested to propose sidewalks on one side of the road only**
- 2. A waiver from Section 1, Article B (10) - Minimum Buildable Lot standard - Proposed Lot #1 due to earthen berm – buildable square footage = 18,141 sqft**
- 3. A waiver from Section 1, Article B (10) - Minimum Buildable Lot standard - Proposed Lot #2 due to earthen berm – buildable square footage = 17,880 sqft**
- 4. 2 ½ : 1 lot depth to width ratio for Lot 3**
- 5. 2 ½ : 1 lot depth to width ratio for Lot 5**

The Technical Review Committee has reviewed all the submitted materials and concluded that all major engineering issues have been successfully addressed. The TRC recommends Approval with the following conditions:

1. Wetlands - The applicant has received an approval from RIDEM Wetlands for the original 15 lot subdivision dated November 5, 2004. An amended permit for the revised plan must be a condition for preliminary approval.

2. Groundwater - The seasonal high ground water elevation must be determined in order to set the house elevations set above the seasonal high ground water elevation. Ground water elevations must be taken and documented during the wet season in the existing test pipes and also in two additional test pipes located also on the northerly side of the property.

3. Sanitary sewers - The developer must establish a maintenance fund for future maintenance and service of the proposed pumping station. The detail for the sewer trench must be modified to conform to current Town standards.

4. Off-Site Improvements – Due to the existing condition of the Angell Road South pump station, the developer is requested to pay for proposed improvements. This station is near to the design capacity for the already existing, platted lots that have paid sewer assessments. This condition is required in order to be able to accept the additional flows from the subdivision without negatively impacting the future ability to connect for the already platted lots. The Town has had some initial conversations with the engineers regarding potential improvements. The TRC recommends the condition of written acceptance of payment for improvements from the developer at this stage of the process.

5. Traffic - The Traffic Report revised October 14, 2004 recommends

mitigation measures for traffic concerns beyond clearing the vegetation on site. The new additional recommendation is to remove a large boulder on the west side of Whipple road south of the proposed Leslie Road that blocks the sight distance. This work must be delineated out in the field prior to site construction and performed by the developer as part of the site development.

6. Open Space – According to our Subdivision Regulation, the proposed development is subject to open space fees for each newly created lot.

7. Landscaped Buffers – Based on the public hearing, the developer agreed to install two evergreen buffer areas. One evergreen buffer area is to be installed on proposed lot #5, along this lot's property line and the property line of existing lot #217. An evergreen buffer is to be installed around the proposed pumping station.

8. Proposed Easements – All proposed easements must be reviewed and approved by the Town Solicitor before final plans are recorded.

9. Remediation Bond – The developer is required to post a cash remediation bond in the amount of \$18,000.00 before any construction can begin.

10. Inspection Fees – The developer is required to pay any and all administrative and inspection fees according to the Subdivision Regulations (Appendix A, Page A).

**c. Meadow View Subdivision AP 29 Lot 3 Pre-Application Review /
- Meridian Real Estate Services Great Road Discussion**

This project represents the subdivision of one lot into fifteen conventional single-family lots. The subject lot contains approximately 13.0 acres of land and is located in zoning district RS-20 (20,000 square feet – Residential Single Family). The proposed homes are to be serviced by public water and sewers.

The Technical Review Committee and the Engineering Division has reviewed the above-proposed development according to the 2001 Land Development and Subdivision Regulation's pre-application submission standards and requirements and standard engineering practices. The submission includes a set of 5 sheets entitled "Pre-application Submission, Meadow View", located on Great Road, Lincoln, Rhode Island, AP 29 Lot 3, prepared for Meridian Real Estate Services, Inc. by DiPrete Engineering Associates, Inc., dated November 2004, revision date 11/1/04. A document entitled "Pre-Application Narrative and Supporting Material" was also received. For assistance in developing the design, the following comments are offered to the applicant:

Wetlands - The wetlands have been flagged by Natural Resources Services according to the above mentioned Narrative report. RIDEM Wetlands approval will be required for preliminary approval of the subdivision.

Utilities - The subdivision is proposed to be connected to public sanitary sewers and water. The applicant must request water service availability for the proposed new lots from Lincoln Water Commission

and public sewer availability from the Lincoln sewer supervisor. The applicant should note that the Lincoln Water Commission is no longer accepting subdivision plans with dead-ended water lines. The water line must be looped. The Narragansett Bay Commission will need to approve the flows before final approval. The location of any septic systems and wells must be shown on the plans in order to ensure that there is no adverse impact to them from the proposed subdivision.

Drainage – The Technical Review Committee expressed great concern about the potential impacts that site runoff could have on existing abutting properties and Great Road. The TRC also expressed concern about the proposed location and size of the detention basin and its ability to accommodate the water that the site may generate when it is developed. The TRC recommends to the applicant that the drainage issues be fully addressed during the Master Plan stage of the review project.

Seasonal High Groundwater - Due to the known seasonal high groundwater in this area, the subdivision must include the condition that any finished floor or basement must be at least one foot above that elevation. A certified seasonal high groundwater elevation must be established prior to the release of any building permits.

Traffic - Great Road is a narrow and winding road and requires careful review for traffic safety, particularly sight distance. The development

requires a report on the impact of traffic on the road and at the intersection to see if improvements are needed. The street lighting needs to be reviewed for safety concerns.

Minimum buildable area - There are several lots that have 15% or greater slopes, wetlands and/or easements. The applicant will need to document the areas of each constraint, taking into account any overlap and then show the minimum buildable area remaining for each lot. The Technical Review Committee could not determine if each lot met the required buildable lot area.

Street Length – The Technical Review Committee could not determine if the proposed roadway is one combined roadway or two roadways. If the proposed road design is considered as two road-ways then the main road way ending in a cul-de-sac measures 720' long. The second road-way that comes off of the main road way, measures 230' long. If the proposed road design is considered as one road-way then the longest point is approximately 740' long. According to the Subdivision Regulations, the maximum distance a proposed road can be is 720' long.

Proposed Lot Configuration - One of the lots, #12 has frontage on two streets making it a through lot which is not legal. The proposed “open space” lot has no viable access therefore is not considered buildable. The design of a non-buildable lot is not legal.

Sidewalks – The Technical Review Committee has concerns about the functionality of the proposed sidewalk. The proposed sidewalk does not provide a cohesive walkway pattern for the new residents.

Visual Impact to Historic Great Road – The Technical Review Committee has concerns about the visual impact that this development may have on Great Road. This road has been designated as an historic road. The TRC is researching if there are any State or Federal restrictions and/or guidelines associated with this designation.

January Zoning Applications

Elaine Remillard, 7 Crestwood Land, Lincoln, RI – Special Use Permit for a Day Care Center located at 1572 Lonsdale Avenue, Lincoln RI.

AP 4, Lot 63 Zoned: RG-7

Members of the Technical Review Committee visited the site and reviewed the submitted site plans and application. Unfortunately, the site plans or application did not adequately address the committee's concerns about the parking requirements or present an accurate plan for traffic circulation. The TRC would like to see scaled site plans that specifically address parking and traffic circulation. In addition, if this special permit application is approved, the TRC has concerns about having the parking located on one separate lot and the building

on another. If this application is approved, the TRC would like to recommend that as a condition of approval, that the applicant merge the two lots into one.

Diane Waters and Susan McGuirl, 2 Shady Brook Circle, Lincoln, RI – Dimensional Variance for the construction of a residential addition.

AP34, Lot 311 Zoned: RS 20

Members of the Technical Review Committee visited the site and reviewed the submitted plans and application. The TRC recommends approval of this application. The committee finds that the dimensional variance will not alter the general character of the surrounding area and will not impair the intent or purpose of the zoning ordinance, nor the Comprehensive Plan.

Robert Gaudette Jr., 6 Country Drive, Greenville, RI – Dimensional Variance for front and side set back for the construction of a steel building for inside storage for property located on Lower Road.

AP4, Lot 38 Zoned: ML 0.5

Members of the Technical Review Committee visited the site and reviewed the submitted plans and application. The TRC recommends denial of this dimensional variance. The committee finds that the proposed building does not allow for safe vehicular access to the rear of the building. While the applicant owns the property to either side of the subject property, the committee has to view this application on

its own merits and as a stand alone lot. With this in mind, access to the northeastern corner of the building would be very limited and therefore a safety hazard. Since this is a vacant lot and the applicant has the choice of building sizes, the committee finds that the relief requested is not the least relief necessary.